UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/673,431	09/30/2003	Gerardo Kobeh	11884/406501	2620

23838   7590   02/14/2008

KENYON & KENYON LLP
1500 K STREET N.W.
SUITE 700
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER
ZECHER, MICHAEL R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3691	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/14/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *30 September 2003*.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.　　2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-27* is/are pending in the application.
　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-27* is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on *30 September 2003* is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
　　a) ☐ All　b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
　　　1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
　　　2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
　　　3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   The following is a first, non-final Office Action on the merits. **Claims 1-27** are

pending.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3.   **Claims 2-12, 14, 26, & 27** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph,

as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject

matter which applicant regards as the invention.

4.   **Claim 2** recites "the <u>domain</u> of the transaction system and the <u>domain</u> of the

grant are different." It is unclear what the "domain" limitation entails. Clarification is

required. For examination purposes, Examiner has construed the limitation as--a

sphere of activity or interest: field--.

      Claims 3-5 recite the "domain" claim limitation and are therefore rejected under

the same rationale set forth above.

      Claim 6 & 10 recite the "domain" claim limitation and are therefore rejected

under the same rationale set forth above.

      Claims 7-9 & 11-12 depend from claims 6 & 10 and therefore contain the same

deficiency.

      Claims 14, 26, & 27 recite the "domain" claim limitation and are therefore

rejected under the same rationale set forth above.

Application/Control Number: 10/673,431   Page 3
Art Unit: 3691

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6.   **Claims 1-10, 13-18, 20, & 22-27** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being

anticipated by Corrie et al. (U.S. 2002/0120538).

       As per claim 1, Corrie et al. teaches a grant management method, comprising:

       responsive to a transaction request and data associated therewith, converting

values of the associated data from a domain of a transaction system to a domain

defined for a grant (See paragraphs 56 & 60, which discusses the interaction between a

grants management system and a financial management system, including the use of

enterprise application integration ("EAI") to process a request of a grant's financial

activities);

       determining if the converted data maps to a classification that has been defined

under the grant to be valid (See paragraphs 60 & 61, which discusses mapping one

system to a defined data schema and sending/receiving messages from one system to

another thereby permitting integration; and, furthermore how the EAI tool component

triggers updates to the financial system whenever any activity in the grants system has

financial significance);

       if so, determining if the converted data would cause a limit defined under the

grant to be exceeded (See paragraphs 155 & 164, which discusses how funds are

obligated based on agreement accounting rules, and how a determination is

dynamically made by the financial management system whether limits are exceeded),

and

admitting the requested transaction unless the limit would be exceeded (See

paragraph 156, which discusses approving a request from a grantee).

As per claim 2, Corrie et al. teaches wherein the domain of the transaction

system and the domain of the grant are different (See figure 1 and paragraph 55, which

illustrates and discusses a separate financial management server and grant

management server) .

As per claim 3, Corrie et al. teaches wherein the domain of the transaction

system is the same as the domain of the grant (See figure 1, which illustrates a financial

management server and grant management server operatively connected in the same

system).

As per claim 4, Corrie et al. teaches storing the transaction data in a database in

the domain defined for the grant (See paragraph 44, which discusses how the grant

management system includes permanent or removable storage on which the process

and data structures can be stored and distributed).

As per claim 5, Corrie et al. teaches determining if a report and/or a bill are due

according to a predetermined set of report and billing rules (See paragraphs 77 & 161,

which discusses status reports; and, furthermore, how the system receives financial

reports and verifies award compliance);

retrieving transactional data stored in the domain define for the grant (See

paragraph 160, which discusses accessing information from the grant management

system); and

if the report and/or the bill are determined to be due, generating the report and/or

the bill in the domain defined for the grant (See paragraphs 77 & 161, which discusses

status reports; and, how the system receives financial reports and verifies award

compliance).

As per claim 6, Corrie et al. teaches an enterprise management system,

comprising:

a transaction management system (See figure 1, which illustrates a financial

management system), operating under a predetermined set of transaction rules and

responsive to a transaction request by validating and accepting the transaction (See

paragraphs 129 & 163, which discusses approving payment requests and accepting

grant financial reports);

a grants management system provided in communication with the transaction

system (See figure 1, which illustrates a grants management system operatively

connected with a financial management system) and comprising:

an interpretation logic unit to covert values of the transaction request from

a domain of the transaction system to a domain defined for an identified grant (See

paragraphs 56 & 60, which discusses the interaction between a grants management

system and a financial management system, including the use of EAI to process a

request of a grant's financial activities);

a dimensional control unit to determine if the converted data maps to a classification that has been defined under the grant to be valid (See paragraphs 60 & 61, which discusses mapping one system to a defined data schema and sending/receiving messages from one system to another thereby permitting integration; and, furthermore how the EAI tool component triggers updates to the financial system whenever any activity in the grants system has financial significance);

an availability control unit to determine if the converted data would cause a limit defined under the grant to be exceeded (See paragraphs 155 & 164, which discusses how funds are obligated based on agreement accounting rules, and how a determination is dynamically made by the financial management system whether limits are exceeded); and

a database storing converted transaction of the transaction requests that map to valid classifications that do not exceed the defined limits (See paragraph 44, which discusses how the grant management system includes permanent or removable storage on which the process and data structures can be stored and distributed).

Claim 7 recites equivalent limitations to claim 4 and is therefore rejected using the same art and rationale set forth above.

As per claim 8, Corrie et al. teaches a reporting and billing manager to generate a report and/or a bill when due according to a predetermined set of reporting and billing rules (See paragraphs 77 & 161, which discusses status reports; and, furthermore, how the system receives financial reports and verifies award compliance).

As per claim 9, Corrie et al. teaches wherein the reports and bills are generated in the domain defined for the identified grant (See paragraphs 77 & 161, which discusses status reports; and, how the system receives financial reports and verifies award compliance).

As per claim 10, Corrie et al. teaches an enterprise management system, comprising:

a transaction management system (See figure 1, which illustrates a financial management system), operating under a predetermined set of transaction rules and responsive to a transaction request by validating and accepting the transaction (See paragraphs 129 & 163, which discusses approving payment requests and accepting grant financial reports);

a grants management system provided in communication with the transaction management system (See figure 1, which illustrates a grants management system operatively connected with a financial management system) and responsive to the transaction request by:

converting values of the transaction request from a domain of the transaction system to a domain defined for an identified grant (See paragraphs 56 & 60, which discusses the interaction between a grants management system and a financial management system, including the use of EAI to process requests of a grant's financial activities);

determining if the converted data maps to a classification that has been defined under the grant to be valid (See paragraphs 60 & 61, which discusses mapping

one system to a defined data schema and sending/receiving messages from one system to another thereby permitting integration; and, furthermore how the EAI tool component triggers updates to the financial system whenever any activity in the grants system has financial significance);

if so, determining if the converted data would cause a limit defined under the grant to be exceeded (See paragraphs 155 & 164, which discusses how funds are obligated based on agreement accounting rules, and how a determination is dynamically made by the financial management system whether limits are exceeded); and

causing the transaction system to reject the requested transaction if the limit would be exceeded (See paragraphs 152 & 164, which discusses rejecting a grant; and, furthermore, adjusting commitments and obligations based on drawdowns and accruals; additionally it is inherent to reject funds based on not satisfying account rules).

As per claim 13, Corrie et al. teaches a method for managing grants received from a sponsor, comprising:

receiving a transaction request and data associated with the transaction request (See paragraph 160, which discusses accessing information from the grant management system);

determining if the transaction request satisfies administrative and financial requirements imposed by the sponsor (See paragraphs 77 & 161, which discusses status reports; and, how the system receives financial reports and verifies award compliance);

if so, admitting the transaction request (See paragraph 129, which discusses

approving payment requests).

As per claim 14, Corrie et al. teaches converting the associated data to a

predetermined domain of a grant (See paragraphs 56 & 60, which discusses the

interaction between a grants management system and a financial management system,

including the use of EAI to process a request of a grant's financial activities).

As per claim 15, Corrie et al. teaches determining if the associated data maps to

a valid budget entry for a grant (See paragraphs 60 & 61, which discusses mapping one

system to a defined data schema and sending/receiving messages from one system to

another thereby permitting integration; and, furthermore how the EAI tool component

triggers updates to the financial system whenever any activity in the grants system has

financial significance).

As per claim 16, Corrie et al. teaches rejecting the transaction request if the

associated data maps to an invalid budget entry for the grant (See paragraphs 155 &

164, which discusses how funds are obligated based on agreement accounting rules,

and how a determination is dynamically made by the financial management system

whether limits are exceeded).

As per claim 17, Corrie et al. teaches determining if the associated data is

consistent with a budgetary plan (See paragraph 129, which discusses approving

payment requests; additionally it is inherent that payment request won't be approved

unless it satisfies accounting rules).

As per claim 18, Corrie et al. teaches rejecting the transaction request if the associated data is inconsistent with the budgetary plan (See paragraphs 155 & 164, which discusses how funds are obligated based on agreement accounting rules, and how a determination is dynamically made by the financial management system whether limits are exceeded).

Claim 20 recites equivalent limitations to claim 5 and is therefore rejected using the same art and rationale set forth above.

As per claim 22, Corrie et al. teaches using a blocking indicator to indicate whether a report and/or a bill are due (See paragraphs 124-126, which discusses how grant managers and financial managers (i.e. manual operators) must clear requests before they are approved).

As per claim 23, Corrie et al. teaches an enterprise management system, comprising:

a transaction management system (See figure 1, which illustrates a financial management system), operating under a predetermined set of transaction rules imposed by a sponsor on a grantee and responsive to a transaction request by validating and accepting the transaction (See paragraphs 129 & 163, which discusses approving payment requests and accepting grant financial reports); and

a grants management system provided in communication with the transaction system (See figure 1, which illustrates a grants management system operatively connected with a financial management system), to determine if the transaction request satisfies the predetermined set of transaction rules imposed by the sponsor, and if so,

storing transaction data, (See paragraphs 77, 160, & 161 which discusses accessing information from the grant management system, status reports, and how the system receives financial reports and verifies award compliance) wherein the grants management system comprises:

a reporting and billing manger to generate a report and/or bill to the sponsor pursuant to a predetermined set of reporting and billing rules and the transaction data (See paragraphs 77 & 161, which discusses status reports; and, how the system receives financial reports and verifies award compliance).

As per claim 24, Corrie et al. teaches wherein the sponsor and grantee run the grant on different terms (See paragraphs 1-7, which discusses how federal grants management and different agencies have diverse procedures and requirements related to grants management).

Claim 25 recites equivalent limitations to claim 5 and is therefore rejected using the same art and rationale set forth above.

As per claim 26, Corrie et al. teaches wherein the grant management system further comprises:

an interpretation logic unit to convert values of the transaction request from a domain of the transaction system to a domain defined for an identified grant (See paragraphs 56 & 60, which discusses the interaction between a grants management system and a financial management system, including the use of EAI to process a request of a grant's financial activities);

a dimensional control unit to determine if the converted data maps to a classification that has been defined under the grant to be valid (See paragraphs 60 & 61, which discusses mapping one system to a defined data schema and sending/receiving messages from one system to another thereby permitting integration; and, furthermore how the EAI tool component triggers updates to the financial system whenever any activity in the grants system has financial significance);

an availability control unit to determine if the converted data would cause a limit defined under the grant to be exceeded (See paragraphs 155 & 164, which discusses how funds are obligated based on agreement accounting rules, and how a determination is dynamically made by the financial management system whether limits are exceeded); and

a database storing converted transaction of transaction requests that map to valid classifications that do not exceed the defined limits (See paragraph 44, which discusses how the grant management system includes permanent or removable storage on which the process and data structures can be stored and distributed).

As per claim 27, Corrie et al. teaches an enterprise management system, comprising:

a transaction management system (See figure 1, which illustrates a financial management system), operating under a predetermined set of transaction rules and responsive to a transaction request by validating and accepting the transaction (See paragraphs 129 & 163, which discusses approving payment requests and accepting grant financial reports);

a grants management system provided in communication with the transaction

system (See figure 1, which illustrates a grants management system operatively

connected with a financial management system) and comprising:

an interpretation logic unit to covert values of the transaction request from

a domain of the transaction system to a domain defined for an identified grant (See

paragraphs 56 & 60, which discusses the interaction between a grants management

system and a financial management system, including the use of EAI to process a

request of a grant's financial activities);

a dimensional control unit to determine if the converted data maps to a

classification that has been defined under the grant to be valid (See paragraphs 60 &

61, which discusses mapping one system to a defined data schema and

sending/receiving messages from one system to another thereby permitting integration;

and, furthermore how the EAI tool component triggers updates to the financial system

whenever any activity in the grants system has financial significance);

an availability control unit to determine if the converted data would cause

a limit defined under the grant to be exceeded (See paragraphs 155 & 164, which

discusses how funds are obligated based on agreement accounting rules, and how a

determination is dynamically made by the financial management system whether limits

are exceeded); and

a database storing converted transaction of the transaction requests that

map to valid classifications that do not exceed the defined limits (See paragraph 44,

which discusses how the grant management system includes permanent or removable

storage on which the process and data structures can be stored and distributed); and

a reporting and billing manager to submit a report and/or a bill according

to a predetermined set of rules (See paragraphs 77 & 161, which discusses status

reports; and, how the system receives financial reports and verifies award compliance).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8.   **Claims 11, 19, & 21** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Corrie et al. (U.S. 2002/0120538), and further in view of Official Notice.

As per claim 11, Corrie et al. teaches a first database (See paragraph 44, which

discusses how the grant management system includes permanent or removable

storage on which the process and data structures can be stored and distributed).

However, Corrie et al. does not disclose first and second databases, one

provided for the transaction system and the other provided for the grants management

system, each storing transaction data of transactions admitted by the grants

management system, the transaction system's database storing the original transaction

data and the other grants management database storing the converted transaction data.

The Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known in the art to

include multiple databases in systems that are operatively connected. Therefore, it

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Corrie et al. to include a first and second database for storing transaction data and converted transaction data in order to combine the known features of multiple operative systems and databases to achieve the predictable result of having more than one database for transaction data.

As per claim 19, Corrie et al. does not disclose wherein the administrative and financial requirements from one sponsor is different form the administrative and financial requirements from another sponsor.

The Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known in the art to have different financial and administrative requirements for various grants (i.e. different requirements for financial aid loans as opposed to housing lotteries). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Corrie et al. to include different financial and administrative requirements for various grants in order to combine the known features of grants and lending criteria to achieve the predictable result of assuring that a grantor's requests are satisfied.

As per claim 21, Corrie et al. does not disclose wherein the report and the bill are generated according to the sponsor's currency, dimension, and fiscal year.

The Examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known in the art to generate reports or bills according to pre-determined criteria. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Corrie et al. to include generating reports and bills according to a sponsor's

request in order to combine the known features of reporting/billing and lending criteria to

achieve the predictable result of providing lender's with documentation of bill/reports

(i.e. billing/reporting at the end of every fiscal year).

9.   **Claim 12** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corrie

et al. (U.S. 2002/0120538), and further in view of Chen (U.S. 7,111,010).

As per claim 12, Corrie et al. teaches wherein the grants management system

comprises a database (See paragraph 44, which discusses how the grant management

system includes permanent or removable storage on which the process and data

structures can be stored and distributed).

However, Corrie et al. does not disclose wherein the grants management system

comprises a database storing a data cube of aggregated transaction data, the data

cube having dimensions of all parameters defined for all grants managed by the grants

managements system.

Chen (U.S. 7,111,010) discloses techniques for managing information necessary

for providing business support (See abstract).

Both Corrie et al. and Chen disclose methods of managing business information.

Chen discloses the use of data cubes with various dimensions used to store information

(See column 3, lines 20-45, which discusses how cube data and structure are used to

store information). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the

art at the time the invention was made to modify Corrie et al. to include a data cube with

various dimensions containing aggregated transaction data as taught be Chen in order

to use multidimensional models, statistical computations, rule based systems, report

generators and the like to enable a decision maker to understand, analyze and present

relationships among various information entities (See column 4, lines 27-41).

Conclusion

10.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

Calderaro et al. (U.S. 2003/0004736) discloses a system and method for

integrated management of personnel planning factors.

Amaru et al. (U.S. 2003/0177481) discloses an enterprise information unification.

Zou et al. (U.S. 2004/0064332) discloses systems and methods for electronically

processing government sponsored benefits.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to MICHAEL R. ZECHER whose telephone number is

(571)270-3032. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:30-5:00 alt. Fridays

off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Alexander Kalinowski can be reached on 571-272-6771. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Alexander Kalinowski/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 3691

MRZ